

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

HAMILTON COUNTY TELEPHONE CO-OP) DOCKET NO.
and UNITED STATES CELLULAR) 05-0363
OPERATING COMPANY OF CHICAGO, LLC;)
USCOC OF ILLINOIS RSA #1, LLC; USCOC)
OF ILLINOIS RSA #4, LLC; USCOC OF)
ROCKFORD, LLC)
Joint Petition for Approval of)
Negotiated Traffic Termination)
Agreement dated May 13, 2005,)
Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252.)

Springfield, Illinois
July 13, 2005

Met, pursuant to notice, at 2:00 P.M.

BEFORE:

MR. JOHN ALBERS, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

MR. JOSEPH D. MURPHY
306 West Church Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820

(Appearing on behalf of Petitioner ILECs)

MR. JIM NAUMANN
Senior Director
8410 West Bryn Mawr
Chicago, Illinois 60631

(Appearing on behalf of United States
Cellular Operating Company of Chicago, LLC,
via teleconference)

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
Carla J. Boehl, Reporter Ln. #084-002710

APPEARANCES:

(Continued)

MS. STEFANIE GLOVER

MR. JAMES WEGING

Office of General Counsel

160 North LaSalle Street, Suite C-800

Chicago, Illinois 60601

(Appearing on behalf of Staff of the
Illinois Commerce Commission via
teleconference)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

I N D E X

<u>WITNESSES</u>	<u>DIRECT</u>	<u>CROSS</u>	<u>REDIRECT</u>	<u>RECROSS</u>
TORSTEN CLAUSEN & OLUSANJO OMONIYI By Judge Albers				18

I N D E X

<u>EXHIBITS</u>	<u>MARKED</u>	<u>ADMITTED</u>
Staff 1	e-Docket	22

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE ALBERS: By the authority vested in me by the Illinois Commerce Commission, I now call Docket Numbers 05-0360 concerning Adams Telephone Cooperative and US Cellular Operating Company of Chicago, et al.; 05-0363 concerning Hamilton County Telephone Co-Op and US Cellular Operating Company of Chicago, et al.; 05-0365 concerning McDonough Telephone Cooperative, Inc., and US Cellular Operating Company of Chicago, et al.; and 05-0367 concerning Mid-Century Telephone Cooperative, Inc., and US Cellular Operating Company of Chicago, et al. These dockets have not been consolidated and are merely being called together for administrative efficiency purposes. All of these dockets concern a joint petition for approval of a negotiated traffic termination agreement dated on or about May 13, 2005.

May I have the appearances for the record, please?

MR. MURPHY: On behalf of each of the co-ops, Joseph D. Murphy, 306 West Church Street, Champaign,

1 Illinois 61820.

2 MR. NAUMANN: Yes, on behalf of US Cellular,
3 James Naumann, 8410 West Bryn Mawr, Chicago,
4 Illinois 60631.

5 MS. GLOVER: Appearing on behalf of Staff,
6 James Weging and Stefanie Glover with Mr. Clausen
7 and Mr. Omoniyi, 160 North LaSalle Street, Suite
8 C-800, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

9 JUDGE ALBERS: Thank you. Let the record
10 reflect there are no others wishing to enter an
11 appearance.

12 These dockets were carried over to today
13 from last week when it became apparent there was a
14 concern regarding one of Staff's customary
15 recommendations for implementing the negotiated
16 agreements. I have received a verified statement,
17 an amended verified statement, in each of these four
18 dockets and I understand that the carriers have
19 received that as well.

20 I have a clarifying question for the two
21 Staff members that filed these verified statements.
22 So if there are no preliminary matters, why don't,

1 Ms. Glover, why don't you go ahead and call your
2 witnesses and I will swear them in and I will ask my
3 question and offer them up for the other parties as
4 well if they have any questions.

5 MS. GLOVER: Okay. Would Your Honor like to
6 question Mr. Omoniyi or Mr. Clausen first?

7 JUDGE ALBERS: Well, I have the same exact
8 question for both of them. So if you would like to
9 just -- so, if you would like to call them both, I
10 will just swear them both in and ask them both at
11 the same time.

12 MS. GLOVER: Okay, very well. At this time I
13 would like to call Mr. Torsten Clausen and
14 Mr. Olusanjo Omoniyi for questioning, Your Honor.

15 JUDGE ALBERS: Normally I don't like panel
16 witnesses but I will make an exception in my case
17 here. Mr. Clausen and Mr. Omoniyi, could you please
18 stand and raise your right hand?

19 (Whereupon the
20 witnesses were sworn by
21 Judge Albers.)

22 JUDGE ALBERS: First, Mr. Murphy or

1 Mr. Naumann, do either of you have any questions for
2 a Staff witness?

3 MR. MURPHY: I do not.

4 JUDGE ALBERS: Mr. Naumann, do you have any
5 questions?

6 MR. NAUMANN: No, I do not.

7

8 TORSTEN CLAUSEN and OLUSANJO OMONIYI
9 called as Witnesses on behalf of Staff of the
10 Illinois Commerce Commission, having been first duly
11 sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

12 DIRECT EXAMINATION

13 BY JUDGE ALBERS:

14 Q. I know both of you filed individual
15 statements in different dockets here. I think I can
16 ask you both the same question and if your answer is
17 different, let me know. You both had the same
18 recommendation on the last page of your amended
19 verified statements concerning the list that the
20 co-op should file and indicating what negotiated
21 agreements they have. And in one of the paragraphs
22 you make the statement that the Commission can make

1 this list available to the public by whatever means
2 the Commission deems expeditious, including creating
3 a computer link to the list on the Commission's
4 website. One, do you believe the Commission should
5 create such a computer link to the Commission's
6 website? And if that's not a specific
7 recommendation, is there some other recommendation
8 that you are wanting the Commission to -- some other
9 way the Commission should make this information
10 publicly available?

11 A. (MR. OMONIYI) Omoniyi here, if I may
12 answer that question. The standard practice has
13 always been that since we have the e-Docket
14 beginning from 2000, we have been making all these
15 interconnection agreements, including Staff's
16 verified statement and the interconnection
17 agreement, we have been making them available on
18 line. There is nothing unusual here. We just hope
19 that in this process the co-op will be making their
20 interconnection agreement available, just as other
21 companies have been doing. It makes it easier on
22 all the interested parties, including the co-op,

1 just as well as members of the public or any CLECs
2 that may be looking for the lease or the
3 interconnection agreement of these companies.

4 And we have discussed at length with the
5 ITS department. There is no problem in creating it,
6 just as well as the chief clerk's office indicated
7 to us that that has always been the process and they
8 will be able to do it with this.

9 Q. But let me ask it this way. As I
10 understand Staff's, quote, usual implementation
11 recommendations with non co-op carriers, there is
12 typically two recommendations, one that the company,
13 that the ILEC, file a verified statement saying the
14 agreement was the same as previously filed and Staff
15 recommends that the agreement itself be made
16 available through the Commission's website. Staff
17 also typically recommends -- and let me strike that.
18 That recommendation there I see is still made, that
19 the verified statement is as filed and the agreement
20 itself be put on the website.

21 The other recommendation I understand Staff
22 typically makes is that the company file a tariff

1 reflecting, you know, referencing the
2 interconnection agreement. And the tariffs are not
3 on the Commission's website. They are simply on
4 file, publicly available through the clerk's office.

5 The change so to speak in your
6 implementation recommendation, I just wanted to make
7 sure you are not suggesting that we start a
8 reference, you know, start a new website link.

9 A. (MR. CLAUSEN) This is Torsten Clausen.
10 You know, I think the recommendation or at least the
11 possible recommendation, the potential solution to
12 the lack of having tariffs in the co-op, was not
13 necessarily to create a new website but have those
14 companies file the updated list of interconnection
15 agreements in whatever the latest docket was where
16 the Commission approved a new interconnection
17 agreement with one of the co-ops and then have just
18 a link on our website to the latest list of
19 interconnection agreements with that co-op.

20 Obviously, it is very user friendly in the
21 sense that it might even go a step further than what
22 some of the other ILECs have. As I am aware, only

1 SBC and Verizon have to make their tariffs available
2 online. Other ILECs that have tariffs on file with
3 us do not have that functionality. So technically
4 this is very user friendly in terms of finding those
5 lists.

6 But I don't think it is necessarily an
7 additional burden to create those links to the lists
8 that are currently in those dockets, if that makes
9 any sense.

10 Q. You are touching on what I am getting at
11 here and that is whether or not this is meant to
12 create an additional level of public awareness by
13 putting these lists on the website whereas the
14 tariffs themselves are not on the website. I am not
15 saying it is a bad idea. I am just trying to make
16 sure I understand what it is you are recommending.

17 So you are recommending in fact that the
18 Commission put a link on its website to these lists
19 that are to be filed that you suggest be filed by
20 each of these co-ops with the clerk's office?

21 A. (MR. OMONIYI) Exactly. Omoniyi here.
22 That's exactly what we have in mind. Just what we

1 currently have like in the case of Verizon's lease
2 interconnection agreement, because there is a stack
3 of information here, the Docket Number, the name of
4 the CLEC that has the agreement with the co-op, and
5 the date of approval, just three basic pieces of
6 information in there. Then that saves a lot of time
7 having people have to hunt through almost literally
8 a thousand interconnection agreements that we have
9 been having in place since 2000. It just makes it
10 easier for people to just see this agreement between
11 Adams Telecom, I mean telephone company, and just be
12 able to click into it and the information would drop
13 down.

14 We have gone through the technical
15 requirements with the ITS, and everybody feels
16 comfortable with the proposal that it could do it.
17 It is not a burden for the company. The company
18 themselves are not the ones doing it. They just
19 file it with the chief clerk's office. The chief
20 clerk's office hands it off to the ITS department.
21 Any time, though, if a telephone company has an
22 additional docket coming in, they just revise the

1 list in that process.

2 Q. And, Mr. Clausen, you are in agreement with
3 that statement by Mr. Omoniyi?

4 A. (MR. CLAUSEN) Yes, I just want to add to
5 that that we have to keep in mind that the co-ops
6 don't have any tariffs at all with us on file. So
7 that if some other carrier wants to even find out
8 what interconnections are there, they cannot go to
9 the clerk's office and look at the tariff, which
10 they can do for some of the small ILECs, even for
11 the ones that don't have the tariffs available
12 online. So this is kind of compensating for that
13 fact.

14 But also we should keep in mind that this
15 link that we are creating, it is just a link. It is
16 from our website to our website. It is just a link
17 to the list that is filed in that current docket on
18 e-Docket. So, and like Mr. Omoniyi says, the IT
19 persons are aware of this and so they seem to be
20 okay with the proposal. And it just seems an easy
21 way for other potential carriers to find out if the
22 co-op already has interconnection agreements and

1 also, considering that we are having this discussion
2 now, it probably is not going to happen as
3 frequently as some of the other ILECs that have
4 interconnection agreements with co-ops.

5 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay, thank you, gentlemen.
6 Ms. Glover, do you have any redirect?

7 MS. GLOVER: No, there is nothing else.

8 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Thank you. Is it
9 your desire that these four verified statements be
10 admitted into the record in their respective
11 dockets?

12 MS. GLOVER: Yes, Your Honor, it is.

13 JUDGE ALBERS: And are these on e-Docket?

14 MS. GLOVER: They all have been filed on
15 e-Docket and they all have tracking numbers, if you
16 would like me to read them into the record.

17 JUDGE ALBERS: If you could tell me the date
18 they were filed, I would appreciate that.

19 MS. GLOVER: I can. In Docket 05-0360 it was
20 filed July 13, 2005. Docket 05-0363 also filed
21 today, July 13. The same with Docket 05-0365 and
22 the final remaining verified statement from

1 Mr. Clausen was filed yesterday, July 12, and that's
2 Docket Number 05-0367.

3 JUDGE ALBERS: Thank you. Is there any
4 objection to the admission into the record of these
5 verified statements in their respective dockets?

6 MR. MURPHY: No objection on behalf of any of
7 the co-ops in their own dockets.

8 JUDGE ALBERS: And Mr. Naumann?

9 MR. NAUMANN: No objection.

10 JUDGE ALBERS: Thank you. Then each of the
11 verified statements, amended verified statements,
12 will be admitted into the respective docket.

13 (Whereupon Staff
14 Exhibit 1 was admitted
15 into evidence.)

16 JUDGE ALBERS: Do the companies have anything
17 they would like to add for the record?

18 MR. MURPHY: No, Your Honor.

19 JUDGE ALBERS: Do the co-ops agree to the
20 implementation recommendation that Staff has made in
21 each docket?

22 MR. MURPHY: Yes, Your Honor.

1 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Thank you very much.

2 Is there anything for the record from anyone?

3 MS. GLOVER: Nothing from Staff.

4 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay. Then I thank each of you

5 and wish you all a good afternoon. I will mark the

6 record heard and taken in each docket.

7 HEARD AND TAKEN

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22